



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,095	12/01/2000	Dario de Judicibus	GB920000002US1	4536

7590 03/25/2003

Derek S. Jennings
IBM Corporation, I.P. Law Dept.
T. J. Watson Research Center
P.O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2175

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/728,095	JUDICIBUS, DARIO DE	
	Examiner Tony Mahmoudi	Art Unit 2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

Q.Q
3/21/03
D.P.
3/21/03
D.P.
3/21/03

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. *DOV POPOVICI*

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on 03-January-2003, claims 1, 4, 9, and 16 are amended per applicant's request. Claims 1-17 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knutson et al (U.S. patent No. 5,870,746) in view of Balabine et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,406.)

As to claim 1, Knutson et al teaches a system which is responsive to a query, comprising at least one conditional attribute and at least one display attribute, to produce an associated report comprising at least one object, the at least one object comprising the at least one displayed attribute (see Abstract), the system comprising:

first means for rendering the at least one object from a report (see column 2, lines 20-25, and see column 18, lines 16-22, where "object from a report" is read on "segment");
the first means, responsive to user interaction with the rendered report (see column 6, lines 56-62), for selecting one of the at least one displayed attribute and causing the one of

the at least one displayed attribute to change to respective the at least one conditional attribute (see column 8, line 65 through column 9, line 9, where “conditional attributes” is read on “the relationship between measures and the constraints placed upon them”); second means for rendering the at least one conditional attribute for a query (see column 16, lines 38-54);

the second means, responsive to user interaction with the at least one rendered conditional attribute, for selecting one of the at least one conditional attribute and causing the one of the at least one conditional attribute to change to respective the at least one displayed attribute (see column 27, lines 39-47); and

means, responsive to the at least one conditional and displayed attributes, for generating a subsequent query (see column 64, lines 44-65.)

Knutson et al does not teach a system adapted to cooperate with a data engine.

Balabine et al teaches a file system interface to a database (see Abstract), in which he teaches a system adapted to cooperate with a data engine (see column 5, lines 55-64.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Knutson et al to include a system adapted to cooperate with a data engine.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Knutson et al by the teaching of Balabine et al, because having a system adapted to cooperate with a data engine enables the system CPU to interact with the database independent of the network protocol and be able to provide the functionality for creating and deleting tables within the memory.

As to claim 2, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the data engine is a database (see Knutson et al, column 2, lines 20-28) and the query is an SQL query (see Knutson et al, column 6, lines 35-36, also see column 7, lines 11-15.)

As to claim 3, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the data engine is a simulation tool (see Balabine et al, column 7, lines 13-19, where “simulation” is read on “emulates a file system”.)

As to claim 4, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the first and second selecting means comprise respective means for navigating through the at least one attribute to select a single conditional or displayed attribute to be changed (see Knutson et al, column 8, line 65 through column 9, line 9, and see column 19, lines 16-17.)

As to claim 5, Knutson et al as modified teaches the system comprising:
means, responsive to user interaction with a selected conditional attribute, for determining a value of the selected conditional attribute (see Knutson et al, column 5, lines 32-39) to be used as a condition in the subsequent query (see Knutson et al, column 13, lines 27-36.)

As to claim 6, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the value comprises a complex expression (see Knutson et al, column 3, lines 58-65, where “complex expression” is read on “expression that restricts the value”.)

As to claim 7, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the determining means is responsive to user interaction to determine an adjusted value of the selected attribute's value as the condition (see Knutson et al, column 16, lines 1-8.)

As to claim 8, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the first navigation means is responsive to user interaction to cause the selected displayed attribute to change to a conditional attribute and the second navigation means is responsive to user interaction to cause the selected conditional attribute to change to a displayed attribute (see Knutson et al, column 16, lines 38-54, where “changing of attributes” is taught by using “system templates”.)

As to claim 9, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the first and second selecting means are responsive to user interaction to cause all conditional attributes to change to displayed attributes and to cause all displayed attributes to change to conditional attributes (see Knutson et al, column 16, lines 38-54, where “changing of attributes” is taught by using “system templates”.)

As to claim 10, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the first rendering means is adapted to initially display all objects from a report associated with a query (see Knutson et al, column 11, lines 12-19.)

As to claim 11, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the first rendering means is adapted to display the objects in a table (see Knutson et al, figure 6, and see column 11, lines 20-22.)

As to claim 12, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the first rendering means is adapted to display the objects isometrically (see Knutson et al, column 6, line 63 through column 7, line 2, where “dimensional queries for display format” is taught.)

As to claim 13, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the second rendering means is adapted to display the attributes isometrically (see Knutson et al, column 6, line 63 through column 7, line 2, where “dimensional queries for display format” is taught.)

As to claim 14, Knutson et al as modified teaches the system comprising means for receiving user input corresponding to at least a portion of a first query (see Knutson et al, column 25, line 50 through column 26, line 24.)

As to claim 15, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the receiving means comprises one of a natural language interface, a text entry field or a query-by-example analyzer (see Knutson et al, column 15, lines 48-52, and see column 16, lines 65-67.)

As to claim 16, Knutson et al teaches a method which is responsive to a query, comprising at least one conditional attribute and at least one display attribute, to produce an associated report comprising one or more objects, the at least one object comprising the at least one displayed attribute (see Abstract), the method comprising the steps of:

rendering at least one object from a report (see column 2, lines 20-25, and see column 18, lines 16-22, where “object from a report” is read on “segment”);

responsive to user interaction with the rendered report (see column 6, lines 56-62), selecting one of the at least one displayed attribute and causing the one of the at least one displayed attribute to change to respective the at least one conditional attribute (see column 8, line 65 through column 9, line 9, where “conditional attributes” is read on “the relationship between measures and the constraints placed upon them”);

rendering the at least one conditional attribute for a query (see column 16, lines 38-54); responsive to user interaction with the at least one rendered conditional attribute, selecting one of the at least one conditional attribute and causing the one of the at least one conditional attribute to change to respective the at least one displayed attribute (see column 27, lines 39-47); and

responsive to the conditional and displayed attributes, generating a subsequent query (see column 64, lines 44-65.)

Knutson et al does not teach a method adapted to be operable with a data engine.

Balabine et al teaches a file system interface to a database (see Abstract), in which he teaches a method adapted to be operable with a data engine (see column 5, lines 55-64.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Knutson et al to include a method adapted to be operable with a data engine.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Knutson et al by the teaching of Balabine et al, because having a method adapted to be operable with a data engine enables the system CPU to interact with the database independent of the network protocol and be able to provide the functionality for creating and deleting tables within the memory.

As to claim 17, Knutson et al as modified teaches a computer program product comprising computer program code stored on a computer readable storage medium for, when executed on a computing device, allowing a user to refine a query, the program code comprising the system of claim 1 (see Knutson et al, column 2, lines 20-37, and see column 7, lines 38-52.)

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 03-January-2003 with respect to claims 1 and 16 have been fully considered but they are not found to be persuasive:

In response to applicant's argument that "the claims are not obvious by modification Knutson et al in view of Balabine et al", the argument has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive, because it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant's argument that Knutson et al fails to disclose "first means, responsive to user interaction with said rendered report, for selecting one of said at least one displayed attribute and causing said one of said at least one displayed attribute to change to respective said at least one conditional attribute", the argument has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive, because Knutson et al teaches the first means, responsive to user interaction with the rendered report (see column 6, lines 56-62), for selecting one of the at least one displayed attribute and causing the one of the at least one displayed attribute to change to respective the at least one conditional attribute (see column 6, lines 63-66, where "causing the attribute to change" is read on "manipulating data views", and see column 8,

line 65 through column 9, line 9, where “conditional attributes” is read on “the relationship between measures and the constraints placed upon them”.)

In response to applicant’s argument that Knutson et al fails to disclose “second means, responsive to user interaction with the at least one rendered conditional attribute, for selecting one of the at least one conditional attribute and causing the one of the at least one conditional attribute to change to respective the at least one displayed attribute”, the argument has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive, because Knutson et al teaches the display attributes changing to conditional attributes (see above). In addition, Knutson et al teaches causing the conditional attributes to change to display attributes (see column 7, lines 26-37, where “causing conditional attributes changing to display attributes” is explained as “display 22 and input device 21 allow a user to view GUI 40 and enter choices of metadata 25 used in creating analysts”, meaning that the user has the means for selecting which part(s) of metadata would be displayed.)

In response to applicant’s arguments that Balabine et al fails to disclose “first means, responsive to user interaction with said rendered report, for selecting one of said at least one displayed attribute and causing said one of said at least one displayed attribute to change to respective said at least one conditional attribute” in combination with “second means, responsive to user interaction with the at least one rendered conditional attribute, for selecting one of the at least one conditional attribute and causing the one of the at least one conditional attribute to change to respective the at least one displayed attribute”, the

Art Unit: 2175

arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because the primary reference, Knutson et al, teaches both means as discussed above.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4887. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

tm

March 12, 2003


DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100